DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 131 821 HE 008 457

AUTHOR Handley, Alice A.; Sedlacek, William E.
TITLE Characteristics and Work Attitudes of Women Working on Campus. Research Report No. 5-76.
INSTITUTION Maryland Univ., College Park. Counseling Center.
PUB DATE 76
NOTE 25p.
AVAILABLE FROM Counseling Center, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Attitudes; Committees; Decision Making; Employment Opportunities; Equal Opportunities (Jobs); *Females; *Higher Education; *Job Satisfaction; Job Tenure; Leave of Absence; Promotion (Occupational); *Salary Differentials; School Surveys; *Sex Discrimination; Women Professors; Working Women
IDENTIFIERS *University of Maryland

ABSTRACT

A random sample of 390 women employees of the University of Maryland, College Park (130 each from student, classified, and professional employees) were surveyed as to their characteristics and job attitudes. An 80 percent return was achieved, and results showed that the women generally are satisfied with their jobs and generally do not feel overall sex discrimination, although in certain specific areas employee subgroups see problems that should be addressed. Areas in which action is recommended included a strengthening of the EEO committees and a clarification of maternity leave policies. Low pay was cited as a source of dissatisfaction for all groups, and faculty women say differential salary is their major source of inequity with their male peers. Other sources of inequity seen by faculty women included being treated fairly on tenure and promotion decisions, participating on important committees and in decision-making. Classified women employees were concerned with their opportunities for promotion, the balance and flow of their work, and being allowed to take courses during regular working hours. Student women employees were concerned with campus safety and parking. (Author/LBH)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED131821

COUNSELING CENTER

Office of Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND

College Park, Maryland

HE 008 457

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

COUNSELING CENTER
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND
COLLEGE PARK, MARYLAND

CHARACTERISTICS AND WORK ATTITUDES OF WOMEN WORKING ON CAMPUS

Alice A. Handley and William E. Sedlacek

Research Report # 5-76

This study was partially funded by the Women's Commission, University of Maryland, College Park. The conclusions and recommendations presented are those of the writers and are not necessarily those of the Women's Commission.

The writers wish to thank Nona Kuhlman, Jessie Leonard, Kathy Arveson, Marie Bestul, Linda Clement, Martha Sherman and Joyce Wheeler for their assistance in the study.

Computer time for this study was supported in full through the facilities of the Computer Science Center of the University of Maryland.

COUNSELING CENTER
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND
COLLEGE PARK, MARYLAND

CHARACTERISTICS AND WORK ATTITUDES OF WOMEN WORKING ON CAMPUS

Alice A. Handley and William E. Sedlacek

Research Report # 5-76

Summary

A random sample of 390 women employees of the University of Maryland, College Park (130 each from student, classified and professional employees) were surveyed as to their characteristics and job attitudes.

An 80% return was achieved, and results showed that women employees of the University generally are satisfied with their jobs and generally do not feel overall sex discrimination, although in certain specific areas employee subgroups see problems which should be addressed. Areas in which action is recommended for all women employees included a strengthening of the EEEO Committees and a clarification of maternity leave policies. Low pay was cited as a source of dissatisfaction for all groups, and faculty women saw differential salary as their major source of inequity with their male peers. Other sources of inequity seen by faculty women included being treated fairly on tenure and promotion decisions, participating on important committees and in decision making. Classified women employees were particularly concerned with their opportunities for promotion, the balance and flow of their work, and being allowed to take courses during regular working hours. Student women employees were particularly concerned with campus safety and parking.

Specific suggestions for alleviating these and other problems are made, and the implications of the results are discussed in terms of theory and previous research.

As the planning, policy making, research, and hopefully, educating takes place at a university, most of the attention is directed toward students. Courses and services are offered for students in their role as students. Often little, if any, attention is paid to the employees of a college or university and their relationship to the institution. A great range of types of jobs and workers can be found on any campus, including students in roles as employees.

Additionally, as the women's movement has grown in higher education, the lack of knowledge about female employees has created great gaps and limitations in the changes and programming many feel should be accomplished. Aside from a lack of general information about women employees on campus, the writers feel what is even more critical is our lack of information on subpopulations of women. For instance, can and should we treat women faculty, classified employee and student employees alike? Do they have different needs or approaches to their work?

The purpose of the present study was to investigate the characteristics, attitudes and values of women employed in higher education. Of particular interest was the empirical identification of subgroups of women employees who differ in their perspective and outlook toward their jobs. This study was intended to be a first step in a research program concerning working women at the University of Maryland. It will build upon some issues and concerns presented by the Women's Commission (1974), but the study will focus on general variables. More detailed studies on particular issues or subgroups of women will follow.

Method

Three hundred-ninety women employed by the University of Maryland, College Park were randomly sampled from payroll records (130 each from student, classified and professional employees). The undergraduate student sample (N-67)

was limited to students on federal work-study programs; while the other 63 students sampled were graduate students. The classified sample included a wide range of employees from secretarial/clerical, technical/paraprofessional, and service/maintenance occupations. The professional sample included administrators, faculty and nonclassified associate staff.

Three hundred randomly chosen women were sent an anonymous questionnaire (100 in each group) and 90 women (30 in each group) were surveyed by telephone by trained graduate students. The telephone survey allowed for greater in-depth coverage of some areas, and allowed for some unstructured item responses. Return postcards mailed separately allowed for a followup of non-returns of questionnaires while maintaining anonymity.

Data were analyzed using percentages, analysis of variance, Chi square, Eta, Friedman two-way analysis of variance, Pearson correlations and discriminant analysis, all at the .05 level.

Results

Returns were received from 241 women employees (80%) on the written questionnaire (80% professional, 80% classified, and 81% student) and 79 (88%) of the telephone interviews (86% professional, 96% classified, and 80% student). Table 1 shows the percentage responses to demographic items by employee groups. Compared to classified and student women employees, (Chi Square at .05), women professionals were more likely to have been recruited, made more money and had more education, were older, were more likely to be white, were more likely to have a male supervisor, and more likely to feel job pressure. Professionals were less likely to feel they would be working at the Univeristy in five years than were classifieds, and nearly all students expected to be gone. In open-ended responses not shown in the table, professionals reported the most likely reasons for leaving were: advancement (15%), retirement (10%), may not get tenure (8%), geographical relocation (6%)

Table 1.

Percentage* Responses to Demographic Items by Employee Group

	Professional	Classified	Student
1. Your job category:			
a. Faculty, tenured	14	--	--
b. Faculty, untenured	40	--	--
c. Associate staff	32	--	--
d. Secretary/clerical	--	68	--
e. Technical/paraprofessional	--	11	--
f. Service/Maintenance	--	9	--
g. Graduate Student	--	--	60
h. Undergraduate Student	--	--	39
i. Special student	--	--	1
j. Other	10	9	-
2. Your job status:			
a. Full time	80	90	12
b. Part time	19	10	84
3. How did you get your job here?			
a. Through an employment agency	0	2	1
b. By making a direct application	58	30	44
c. Was recruited by the University	30	1	20
d. Other	11	11	34
4. Your salary:			
a. Less than $3,000 per year	1	4	50
b. $3,001 to $5,500 per year	5	9	49
c. $5,501 to $8,000 per year	14	18	--

*All percentages are of the total in each subgroup. Percentages may not add to 100 due to rounding or incomplete responses.

Table 1. (continued)

Percentage* Responses to Demographic Items by Employee Group

	Professional	Classified	Student
4. Your salary: (continued)			
d. $8,001 to $10,000 per year	15	42	1
e. $10,001 to $15,000 per year	44	26	--
f. $15,001 to $20,000 per year	18	--	--
g. $20,001 to $25,000 per year	1	--	--
h. More than $25,000 per year	2	--	--
5. Describe your highest level of formal education:			
a. No formal education diploma	--	7	--
b. High school diploma	1	32	11
c. Trade or business school diploma	--	6	--
d. Some college	1	26	29
e. Associate Arts degree	--	4	1
f. Bachelor's degree	6	20	8
g. Some graduate work	9	2	34
h. Master's degree	28	--	5
i. Post Master's work	20	--	11
j. Ph.D./Professional degree	34	--	--
6. Your age is:			
a. Under 20 years	-	1	31
b. 21-25 years	9	18	46
c. 26-40 years	53	47	19
d. 41-55 years	26	21	2
e. 56 plus	12	11	--

*All percentages are of the total in each subgroup. Percentages may not add to 100 due to rounding or incomplete responses.

Table 1 (continued)

Percentage* Responses to Demographic Items by Employee Group

	Professional	Classified	Student
7. Your ethnic background:			
a. Black (Afro-American; Negro)	5	18	25
b. White (Caucasian)	93	78	70
c. Oriental (Asian American)	1	1	4
d. American Indian (Native American)	1	2	--
e. Other	--	--	--
8a. Your marital status:			
a. Married	64	72	26
b. Single	25	15	71
c. Other	11	14	2
8b. If married, your spouse is:			
a. A student	6	10	2
b. On Maryland faculty	3	1	--
c. On Maryland associate staff	1	2	--
d. A classified employee of the University	1	4	--
e. Working elsewhere	54	57	22
f. Unemployed	1	4	--
9. Do you think you will be working at the University in 5 years?			
a. Yes	28	49	1
b. No	61	42	99

* All percentages are of the total in each subgroup. Percentages may not add to 100 due to rounding or incomplete responses.

Table 1 (continued)

Percentage* Responses to Demographic Items by Employee Group

	Professional	Classified	Student
10. Does your department have an Equal Educational and Employment Opportunity Committee (EEEO)?			
a. Never heard of it	1	14	21
b. Don't know	39	38	65
c. Yes	42	33	9
d. No	14	10	4
11. Your immediate supervisor is:			
a. Male	70	53	59
b. Female	26	41	40
12. The pressure associated with your job is:			
a. Too much a lot of the time	22	11	9
b. Keeps me "on my toes"	41	47	20
c. Not a problem for me	30	40	54
d. Practically non-existent	1	1	15

* All percentages are of the total in each subgroup. Percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding or incomplete responses.

and unsatisfactory job atmosphere (6%) (all percentages are of all professional respondents to the item). Classified's most likely reasons for leaving the University were retirement (12%), advancement (12%), change in spouse's status (6%) and geographical relocation (6%).

In other data not tabled, students were more likely (Chi square - .05) to report interest in using a day-care facility (22% would; 11% not sure) than classifieds (18% would; 16% not sure), or professionals (9% would, 9% not sure). (Percentages are of all respondents in each employee subgroup). Few women in any group reported knowing the maternity leave policy (8% professional, 26% classified, 10% student).

Also, professionals and classifieds had been at the school for an average (mean) of about 6 years and were in their departments or units about 5 years. Students had been at the University and in their units an average of about 1 year.

When asked their most important source of personal satisfaction, all employee groups ranked their families first and outside interests last (fourth). Classifieds and professionals listed their jobs second and personal relationships third, but students listed personal relationships before jobs (Friedman 2-way ANOVA at .05).

Table 2 shows the means and standard deviations on job attitude items by employee groups. A discriminant analysis was conducted to determine if the three employee groups could be empirically differentiated, based on their responses to the items in Table 2. Results showed two clusters of items indicated significant differences (.05) among the groups. Function (cluster) I consisted of items 29, 15, 23, 30 and 22 and was labeled "Conventional Job Pattern." Results showed that professionals, compared to the other groups, tended to work more unscheduled hours and feel that decision-making was important to them, and to feel it was appropriate to have a woman department head. Classifieds, compared to students, worked fewer unscheduled hours, felt decision-making was important, and did not feel a woman should head their department.

Table 2.

Means* and Standard Deviations on Job Attitude Items by Employee Group

	Professional		Classified		Student	
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
13. I feel I am discriminated against because of my political views about the women's movement.	1.71	.87	1.78	.81	1.78	.98
14. It is not important to me to be able to express my views about the women's movement where I work.	2.26	1.20	2.86	1.11	2.41	1.29
15. It is (or would be) appropriate for a woman to head my department or unit.	4.41	1.04	3.59	1.10	4.11	1.23
16. The "housekeeping tasks" (making and serving coffee, dusting, etc.) are shared by all workers, regardless of sex, in my department or unit.	2.48	1.73	2.98	1.49	2.86	1.60
17. It is not important to me that "housekeeping tasks" be shared by all workers, regardless of sex.	2.24	1.30	2.74	1.36	2.22	1.34
18. My co-workers make me feel I am an important part of the department or unit.	3.92	1.13	3.66	1.18	3.72	1.22
19. I usually address my immediate supervisor by his/her first name.	3.61	1.58	2.94	1.49	3.11	1.65
20. I am usually not addressed by my immediate supervisor by my first name.	1.57	1.03	2.14	1.19	1.89	1.33
21. It is important to me to be on a first name basis with my supervisor.	3.18	1.35	2.79	1.17	2.99	1.26
22. Decision-making is not an important function of my work.	1.73	1.03	2.82	1.30	2.58	1.28
23. It is important to me to be able to make decisions in my work.	4.54	.77	4.14	.87	3.80	1.22

* 5 = Strongly agree; 1 = Strongly disagree

Table 2 (continued)

Means* and Standard Deviations on Job Attitude Items by Employee Group

	Professional		Classified		Student	
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
24. Taking everything into account, I am satisfied with my job.	3.63	1.13	3.71	1.07	3.65	1.16
25. It is important to me to be satisfied with my job.	4.61	.72	4.57	.59	4.54	.80
26. There are often remarks or jokes about my being able to perform certain tasks on my job.	2.0	1.22	2.40	1.23	2.89	1.30
27. I do not feel discriminated against in my job because of my sex.	3.79	1.20	3.80	1.12	3.99	1.08
28. Sex discrimination in employment practices is an important issue for me.	4.15	.88	3.69	1.13	4.11	1.07
29. I often work more than the scheduled hours stated in my job description.	4.01	1.38	2.80	1.32	3.04	1.37
30. It is not important to me to be able to complete my work within the scheduled hours of my job description.	2.85	1.44	2.33	1.31	2.55	1.30

*5 = Strongly agree; 1 = Strongly disagree

Function II of the discriminant analysis was labled "Decision-Making," and consisted of items 23, 17, and 28. Classifieds were less likely to feel it important that "housekeeping" tasks should be shared, and less likely to see sex discrimination in employment practices as important than were students or professionals.

Job Satisfaction

Overall, job satisfaction (item 24, Table 2) was unrelated to most variables investigated for all employee groups. For instance, it was not related to age, amount of education, marital status, job tenure, salary, race, full or part-time status, or male or female supervisor. When respondents' scores on items 24 and 25 (importance of job satisfaction) were multiplied together, that new score was also unrelated to the above variables. Using Pearson correlation (.05 level), high job satisfaction (item 24) was related to decision-making being an important function of their work (item 22, r =.30) and decision making being important to them (item 23, r = .14) for all employee groups. Perceiving less sex bias (item 27) was also related to higher job satisfaction (r = .28) for all employee groups.

Decision making was significantly correlated (Pearson - .05) with less perceived job pressure (item 12x22, r = .26: item 12x23, r =.20) and higher salary (item 4x22, r = .31; item 4x23, r = .31) for all employee groups.

From the telephone survey and from separate questions asked in each employee group questionnaire, the principal sources of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction were determined. Professionals were most satisfied with their contact with and helping of people, including students, their freedom and autonomy, and their sense of accomplishment. Professionals were most dissatisfied with their salary, and administrative policies and procedures, particularly opportunities for advancement.

Classifieds were most satisfied with helping people, supervisors and co-workers, job security and work hours and schedules. Classifieds were most dissatisfied with their opportunities for advancement, the balance and flow of their work, and salary. As part of the opportunities for advancement and balance and flow of

work, classifieds reported some difficulty with being given time to take courses during regular working hours. Forty-two percent of the classifieds had taken a University course at some time and 15% were taking a course at the time of the study. Of those who had taken courses, they averaged (mean) about 5 courses taken overall. Of those who took courses, the most common types of courses taken were liberal arts 25%, secretarial training 23%, general self-improvement 14%, and technical 11%.

Students expressed the most job satisfaction from co-workers, knowledge and skills acquired, and freedom and autonomy. Students were most dissatisfied with salary, the balance and flow of work, campus safety and parking.

Sex Bias

Perceived sex bias (item 27, Table 2) was not related (for all employee groups) to race, marital status, full or part-time status, likelihood of leaving the University within five years, age, tenure or importance and opportunity or importance of decision making. A high degree of perceived sex bias was significantly correlated (Pearson -.05) with less job satisfaction (item 24, r = .28), more perceived job pressure (item 12, r = .22), and more education (item 5, r =.14) for all employee groups.

Table 2 shows that while all employee groups tended to agree that there was not sex bias on their jobs (item 27), the issue was significantly more important (F - .05) to professionals and students than it was to classifieds (item 28). Table 3 shows the means and standard deviations of faculty women employee perceptions of job equality with male peers. Means generally showed that faculty women felt worse off than their male peers on each issue raised. They felt the least amount of equality in salary (item 43), opportunities for promotion (item 48), liklihood of tenure attainment (item 47), participation on important committees (item 49), and decision making input (item 56). Women faculty felt the most amount of equality with male peers in office facilities (items 31, 32 and 33), teaching lower level

Table 3.

Means* and Standard Deviations of Faculty Women Employee Perceptions of Job Equality With Male Peers

	Mean	S.D.
Office Facilities:		
31. Physical space	1.94	.51
32. Attractiveness of location	2.04	.40
33. Single vs. multiple occupancy	1.97	.45
Administrative, Research or Teaching Assistance:		
34. Secretarial help	1.93	.35
35. Student help	1.94	.34
36. Support concerning fellowships and grants	1.85	.45
Work Assignments:		
37. Teaching lower level undergraduate courses	1.98	.41
38. Teaching upper level undergraduate courses	1.93	.42
39. Teaching graduate courses	1.95	.40
40. Course load	1.91	.36
41. Student supervision (advisees)	1.91	.53
42. Extra-curricular projects	2.00	.43
Salary, Tenure and Promotions:		
43. Salary for job level	1.56	.56
44. Opportunities for consulting	1.83	.47
45. Opportunities for additional assignments (Summer school, University College, etc.)	1.85	.56
46. Tenure evaluation criteria	1.84	.37
47. Likelihood of tenure attainment	1.67	.48
48. Opportunities for promotion	1.62	.52

* 3= better than male peers; 2 = equal to male peers; 1= worse than male peers

Table 3 (continued)

Means* and Standard Deviations of Faculty Women Employee Perceptions of Job Equality With Male Peers

	Mean	S.D.
Participation in Departmental and Professional Activities:		
49. Important committees	1.69	.53
50. Less prestigious committees	1.92	.42
51. Encouragement to seek offices in professional organizations	1.82	.56
52. Placement of journal articles	1.83	.43
53. Funding for conferences	1.86	.40
54, Research possibilities	1.86	.44
55. Convenient meeting times	1.93	.32
56. Input to formal decision-making	1.75	.56
Interaction With Colleagues:		
57. Participation in informal decisions	1.88	.44
58. Patronizing questions or comments	1.76	.50
59. Hostile questions or comments	1.77	.57
60. Opportunities for socializing	1.78	.57

* 3 = better than male peers; 2 = equal to male peers;
1 = worse than male peers.

undergraduate courses and graduate courses (items 37 and 39), extra-curricular projects (item 42), and student help (item 35).

Discussion

Overall, the results showed that women employees of the University generally were satisfied with their jobs, and generally did not feel overall sex discrimination, although for each employee subgroup there were problem areas which should be addressed. Past research has shown that men generally are more satisfied in their jobs than women (Farley, 1974; Hulin and Smith, 1964 and 1967), although there are a few older studies showing contrary data (e.g., Chase, 1951). However, Hulin and Smith (1964) do not feel that sex per se is the critical variable that leads to high or low job satisfaction. It is rather the entire constellation of variables which consistently covary with sex such as pay, job level, promotion opportunities, and social expectations for women. Interestingly, in the present study, overall job satisfaction and overall perceived sex bias were related to relatively few other variables studied. However, those that perceived less sex bias were more satisfied with their jobs. Also, decision-making was related to increased job satisfaction for all groups. Attempting to include more employees in decision-making functions could reap great benefits to the institution. Increased job pressure and more education were related to more perceived sex bias. While the consequences of higher level jobs may be increased pressure and an understanidng of sex bias, it is not clear that a reduction in job pressure is generally desirable. Job pressure may serve as a stimulating and motivational component in work. This is an area worth further research.

The reader is cautioned against making any cause-effect conclusions from the results of this study. We can note relationships between variables, but future research of an experimental nature is required to determine which variable causes another. For instance, we know that those women employees who perceive more job pressure tend to perceive more sex bias. However, we have no information on which,

if either, causes which.

Previous research has shown that age is related to job satisfaction in a curvilinear way. Satisfaction tends to be highest at the start of one's career, lowest in the 20-29 interval, and then rises steadily until retirement (Herzberg, Mausner, Petersen and Capwell, 1957). The present study indicated no relationship between age and job satisfaction. Additional research may be called for here, since for professional employees in higher education, one typically does not start a career until the late 20's or older.

While job satisfaction and education level were not related in the present study, previous research has noted a relationship for women employees in higher education, although the results are not clear. Farley (1974) found that women with Master's degrees tended to be less satisfied than those with more or less education. However, Reeves (1975) found women administrators with Master's degrees to be more satisfied than those with Bachelor's degrees.

Job satisfaction is perhaps best thought of as a complex set of dimensions rather than a single construct (Sedlacek, 1966; Harlow & Hanke, 1975). Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman (1959) proposed that job satisfaction stems from variables intrinsic to the work itself, while dissatisfiers emanate from variables extrinsic to the work itself. Data from the present study contradict Herzberg's two-factor theory , and strongly indicate that satisfiers and dissatisfiers vary considerably across women university employee groups.

Sex discrimination is perhaps best thought of as an outcome or result, as in Table 3, rather than an attitude, as in Table 2 (Sedlacek and Brooks, 1976; Sedlacek, Brooks, Christensen, Harway and Merritt, 1976). It is easier and more practical to work on specific outcomes than generalized attitudes. It is also notable that the overall attitudes of professional women toward sex bias appeared more positive in Table 2 than their specific outcome evaluation in Table 3, although the latter showed faculty only.

General issues that could be approached for all groups of women employees include the establishing or strengthening of the Equal Educational and Employment Opportunity (EEEO) Committees in the departments, since most women employees reported that there was none, they didn't know if one was operating, or they had never heard of it. If this vehicle is to serve women employees with problems of discrimination, it should be more viable. Also, if the EEEO system cannot be improved, other methods should be explored. In addition, the great majority of women employees did not know the University policy on maternity leave (the current University policy on maternity leave is based on sick leave, with no pre-judgment period), although since the data were gathered, the policy has been circulated campus-wide. It was also clear that all women employees were dissatisfied with their pay, and faculty women felt they were being paid less than their male peers. This should be investigated and the data publicly reported by the University. If there is a pay differential, action should be taken. A study conducted at the University of Maryland, College Park, on this topic (Anderson, Beauchamp and Snow. 1975) concluded that "There is substantial statistical evidence that, on the average men were paid more than women in the same faculty rank in 1974-75, even when the department and year of appointment to rank were matched." (p.6). They recommended that wherever such differences cannot be satisfactorily "explained," extra funds for female faculty should be provided.

Perhaps the most interesting finding of the study is the differences that do exist among groups of women employees. Clearly, planning and programming should be done independently for the groups included in the study and perhaps many others.

Professionals

Professional women employees were different in many ways from their non-professional counterparts. They were more educated, older, and dealt with higher level tasks involving decision-making, and were more apt to feel job pressure and that sex discrimination was an important issue, although they didn't feel any more

sex discrimination than non-professional women employees. Issues that could be approached that concern professional women employees are to increase the number of minority women and women department heads. There is a much smaller percentage of minority women professionals than non-professionals, and professional women feel strongly that it is appropriate to have women department heads. While professional women got a sense of accomplishment from their work, they were very concerned with being paid equitably, being treated fairly on tenure and promotion decisions, and on participating on important committees and having input on decisions. They are not only dissatisfied with these areas, but they tend to feel that these issues are the most important to them. According to Adams (1965), inequity is a source of tension, and the greater the feeling of inequity, the greater the drive to reduce the tension (e.g., the more importance assigned the issue). The implication here is to reduce the inequity which will reduce the tension and the importance attached to the areas.

Classifieds

Classified women tend to work fewer unscheduled hours, are less likely to feel women should be department heads, and don't feel decision-making on the job or sex bias are as important as issues as they are to non-classified employees. They liked their job security, but flexible work schedules were very important to them. Many felt a need to take University courses during working hours, and they found this difficult at present. Much could be done concerning this point. Supervisors should be as flexible as possible in allowing, and indeed, encouraging women classifieds to take more courses during normal working hours.

Programs such as "flextime," which are being instituted in other organizations, should be considered for possible implementation at the University. Flextime programs allow employees to determine, often within some limits, what their working hours will be. Since the University offers courses, programs and events at many times other than the typical 8:30 - 4:30 schedule, allowing for staggered, flexible classified employee schedules seems desirable. More and better coordination with

the schedules of professional and student employees could likely be achieved. A flextime program could also help with another source of dissatisfaction for classified women employees: the balance and flow of work. More hours could be spent working during busy times and fewer hours during slack periods. Additionally, allowing greater flexibility in taking courses would result in further training for classified women and hence increase their potential for promotions. This is desirable since the lack of chances for promotion was cited as a major source of job dissatisfaction by classified women employees.

Students

Women student employees are in a much different situation than non-student employees. Nearly all will be gone within five years, and they have been employed an average of only about a year, compared to six years for non-students. They are younger and more interested in inter personal relations than their jobs, although they feel they gain knowledge and skills while working. Like professionals, they tend to work unscheduled hours and feel that sex discrimination is important. They are more concerned about campus safety than the other groups. Previous research at the University has shown that rape is an issue of primary concern, particularly to younger women (Herman and Sedlacek, 1974). Improved building security, lighting, escort services and self-defense classes are called for. Changes have been made in recent years on this issue, but student employees are still concerned.

Parking was also a source of dissatisfaction to women student employees. Since their jobs often require them to be on campus longer or for more specific times than students in general, a special student women employee parking permit and/or special reserved parking areas ought to be considered. Parking is only part of the larger problem of employee transportation, but the University should reinforce the benefits of being an employee, and it may be feasible to provide some benefits through parking privileges.

Even though the numbers were relatively small, student employees expressed

more interest in a campus day-care facility than other groups, and this should be given serious consideration. Bravy and Sedlacek (1976) provided some evidence of the need of such a facility at the University.

The reader is reminded that the undergraduate portion of the student sample consisted of work-study students who may not represent all student employees of the University.

Final Considerations

One possible limitation to the study is the number of analyses conducted, thus increasing the likelihood that some results would occur by chance. According to Sakoda, Cohen and Beall (1954), one would expect about 10 statistical tests out of 115 conducted to be significant due to chance at the .05 level. Fifty-eight results out of 115 were found to be significant in this present study, indicating that the amount of significance is considerably more than we could expect by chance.

Further research would appear to be called for in a number of areas aside from those already discussed. These include a more detailed study of the differences in the attitudes and perceptions of those employees who plan to leave the University within five years and those who plan to stay, and further delineation and comparison of subgroups of employees such as tenured vs. untenured faculty, secretarial vs. non-secretarial classified employees, undergraduate versus graduate students, and female versus male employees. The latter point is an important one, but women should not always determine their status and define themselves in relation to men. Without any data on men, the present study has demonstrated the utility of information on groups of women employees in planning and programming for their needs and improved status as University employees.

References

Adams, J.S. Inequity in social exchange. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology II*, 267-300. New York: Academic Press, 1965.

Anderson, N.S., Beauchamp, V.W., & Snow, G.A. A study of possible sex bias in faculty salaries. University of Maryland, College Park, 1975.

Bravy, S.S. and Sedlacek, W.E. Student and faculty-staff interest in a University-sponsored day care facility. *Counseling Center Research Report # 1-76*, University of Maryland, College Park, 1976.

Chancellor's Commission on Women's Affairs, *The Status of Women*. University of Maryland, College Park, 1974.

Chase, F.S. Factors for satisfaction in teaching. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 1951, 33, 127-132.

Farley, J. Men, women, and work satisfaction on campus. *Cornell Journal of Social Relations*, 1974, 9, 17-33.

Harlow, D.N. and Hanke, J.J. *Behavior in Organizations*, Boston, Mass.: Little, Brown & Co., 1975.

Herman, M.H. and Sedlacek, W.E. Female university student and staff perceptions of rape. *Journal of the National Association for Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors*, 1974 , 38, 20-21.

Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., Petersen, R., & Capwell, D. *Job attitudes: Review of research and opinion*. Pittsburgh, Pa.: Psychological Service of Pittsburgh, 1957.

Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. *The motivation to work*. New York: Wiley, 1959.

Hulin, C.L. & Smith, P. Sex differences in job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 1964, 48, 88-92.

Hulin, C.L. & Smith, P. An empirical investigation of two implications of the two-factor theory of job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 1967, 51, 396-402.

Reeves, M.E. An analysis of job satisfaction of women administrators in higher education. *Journal of the National Association for Women Deans, Administrators and Counselors*, 1975, 38, 132-135.

Sakoda, J.M., Cohen, B.H., & Beall, G. Tests of significance for a series of statistical tests. *Psychological Bulletin*, 1954, 51, 172-175.

Sedlacek, W.E. Empirical and theoretical aspects of job satisfaction. Doctoral Dissertation, Kansas State University, 1966 (University Microfilms 66-6489, 214).

Sedlacek, W.E. and Brooks, G.C., Jr. *Racism in American Education: A model for change*. Chicago: Nelson-Hall, Inc., 1976.

Sedlacek, W.E., Brooks, G.C., Jr., Christensen, K.C., Herman, M.H., & Merritt, M.S. Racism and sexism: A comparison and contrast. *Journal of the National Association for Women Deans, Administrators and Counselors*, 1976, 39, 120-127.